

Quantized Neighbourhoods

Pablo Arrighi*

*Université de Grenoble,
LIG, 46 Avenue Félix Viallet,
38031 Grenoble Cedex, France.*

Vincent Nesme[†] and Reinhard Werner[‡]

*Leibniz Universität Hannover,
Institut für theoretische Physik,
Appelstr. 2, 30167 Hannover, Germany.*

Consider a set of physical systems, evolving according to some global dynamics yielding another set of physical systems. Such a global dynamics f may have a causal structure, i.e. each output physical system may depend only on some subset of the input physical systems, whom we may call its “neighbours”. We can of course write down these dependencies, and hence formalize them in a bipartite graph labelled with the physical systems sitting at each node, with the first (resp. second) set holding the global state of the composite physical system at time t (resp. t'), and the edges between the parties stating which physical systems may influence which. Moreover if f is bijective, then we can quantize just by linear extension, so that it now turns into a unitary operator $Q(f)$ acting upon this set of, now quantum, physical systems. The question we address is: what becomes, then, of the dependency graph? In other words, has $Q(f)$ got the same causal structure as f ? The answer to this question turns out to be a surprising: No — quantum information can flow faster than classical information. Here we provide concrete examples of this, as well optimal bounds to the extent this can happen, both for single steps, and for asymptotically many. These bounds are strongly related to the dependency graph of the inverse function f^{-1} .

Introduction

In classical as well as in quantum cellular automata a key issue is the structure of neighbourhoods, i.e., of the causal relations between cells. In either case the system is decomposed into many cells, and there is a global dynamical rule f by which all the cells are updated simultaneously. The crucial condition is that in order to determine the state of any cell after the time step, it suffices to know the state of just a small group of cells, known as the neighbourhood of the cell. By definition, the neighbourhoods of all cells are properties of the global transition function f . For a reversible automaton, which is the only kind considered in this paper, we can also look at the neighbourhoods of the inverse f^{-1} . Remarkably, there is almost no relation between the neighbourhood schemes of f and f^{-1} . Indeed, in lattice dimensions ≥ 2 it is undecidable whether a given rule f is invertible, which means that there is no computable function constituting an upper bound on the neighbourhood size of f^{-1} .

To every reversible classical cellular automaton we can associate a quantum cellular automaton, by just considering the classical configurations as the labels of a Hilbert space basis and taking the classical rule f as a permutation of the basis vectors, and hence a unitary operator $Q(f)$. According to the rules of quantum mechanics such a unitary operator implements a transformation of quantum states and observables. The classical system is always included in the quantum system by restricting the observables to the operators that are diagonal in the configuration basis. This allows us to invert the construction: if a quantum cellular automaton has the property that it maps the classical algebra to itself, we can find a classical cellular automaton f so that $Q(f)$ is the given automaton, up to some phases. For quantum cellular automata we can also form an inverse, and define neighbourhoods as in the classical case. The first surprise here is that in the quantum case one can compute the neighbourhoods of the inverse directly from the neighbourhoods of the forward automaton, without using any further details of the system (see proposition 3 below). Accordingly, it is possible to decide whether a proposed local rule defines a reversible quantum cellular automaton by checking some explicitly known finite set of conditions. This is especially surprising in view of the direct links between the classical automaton f and the quantum automaton $Q(f)$. Partly the mystery is resolved by observing

*Electronic address: pablo.arrighi@imag.fr

[†]Electronic address: vincent.nesme@itp.uni-hannover.de

[‡]Electronic address: reinhard.werner@itp.uni-hannover.de

that in order to even define the unitary operator $Q(f)$, the reversibility of f must be clear. Thus the neighbourhoods of $Q(f)$ will depend on the neighbourhoods of both f and f^{-1} . They must be larger than either of them, but not arbitrarily: we can bound the quantum neighbourhood by suitably combining both classical ones (see [SW04] and Prop. 4 below). The bound suggests that in some cases information transmission by $Q(f)$ may be up to three times as fast as by f . We tried to construct such examples, but as it turns out, this is not possible in the long run, and the quantum neighbourhoods of large iterates of $Q(f)$ do not grow as fast as the neighbourhood of a single step suggests (see Theorem 1).

When studying these problems we found it helpful to adopt a very abstract approach to neighbourhood schemes, dropping some of the typical assumptions of cellular automata theory. In particular, we do not assume translation invariance, or even cells of equal size, and allow the system of cells to be entirely different before and after the time step. We also found that the finiteness of the lattice of cells, of local alphabets, and even of the neighbourhoods plays a subordinate role. What remains is a theory of dependence relations in classical distributed and reversible function evaluation.

The article is organised as follows. Section I introduces the vocabulary. In section II, we are going to expose our main results. The first one, Prop. 4, gives a bound on the quantum neighbourhood which is both an improvement and a generalization of the formula to be found in [SW04]. The second one, theorem 1, gives a bound on the quantum neighbourhood in the case of composition of several steps. It should be noted that it is not only a statement on a fixed dynamics — because we do not require the composed steps to be equal. In section III, we are going to prove that these results are optimal by giving examples where the bounds are attained.

Let us summarize the main points of interest.

- Quantum information can jump unboundedly further than classical information. This typically requires prior entanglement shared between parties.
- We give optimal bounds on this quantum neighbourhood as a function of neighbourhood of f and the neighbourhood of the inverse function f^{-1} . That the size of the neighbourhood of the inverse function is unbounded is a classical result in cellular automata theory which we owe to Kari [Kar91, Kar99, Kar96].
- The transmission of messages in iterated quantized dynamics follows a very strict protocol. First the message has to follow the “frontdoor’s” way: at this stage the message is still classical. Then there is a transition, and the rest of the travel is made along the “backdoor’s” way, which is usually outside reach for the classical dynamics — but is in a sense dual to it.
- When iterating a function, quantum information can flow asymptotically faster than classical information, but it cannot flow asymptotically faster than both classical information and time-reversed classical information.
- Therefore in the case of an evolution with a proper time symmetry, quantum information cannot flow asymptotically faster than classical information.

I. GENERALIZATIONS

Let X and Y be two disjoint sets of points. For each $s \in X \cup Y$, a (finite) set of letters Σ_s is given. For a subset S of $X \cup Y$, let Σ_S denote $\prod_{s \in S} \Sigma_s$: these are the words on S . When $T \subseteq S$ and $w \in \Sigma_S$, w_T will denote the restriction of w on T ; if T is a singleton $\{s\}$, we will also denote it w_s . Let f be a function from Σ_X to Σ_Y .

Definition 1 *The dependency graph of f is $G_f = (X \cup Y, E)$, where the set of edges E is defined as follows: E is included in $X \times Y$, and there is an edge from $x \in X$ to $y \in Y$ if and only if there are two words v and w in Σ_X such that $v_{X \setminus \{x\}} = w_{X \setminus \{x\}}$ and $f(v)_y \neq f(w)_y$.*

In informal terms, we put an edge from x to y if w_x is needed to know $f(w)_y$.

The in-neighbourhood of a point $y \in Y$, denoted $\mathcal{N}_f^-(y)$, is $\{x \in X / (x, y) \in E\}$. It is the set of points which have an influence on y through f . In this way, $\mathcal{N}_f^-$ is a function from Y to $\mathfrak{P}(X)$, and it bears the same information as the graph G_f ; such a function is called a *neighbourhood scheme*.

The out-neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_f^+$ is defined as the inverse of $\mathcal{N}_f^-$, that is, for $x \in X$, $\mathcal{N}_f^+(x) = \{y \in Y / (x, y) \in E\}$. It is the set of points on which x has an influence through f .

When $\mathcal{N} : X \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(Y)$ is a neighbourhood scheme and $A \subseteq X$, $\mathcal{N}(A)$ denotes $\bigcup_{x \in A} \mathcal{N}(x)$.

Proposition 1 $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow}(B) \subseteq A$ if and only if for every $v, w \in \Sigma_X$, $v_A = w_A$ implies $f(v)_B = f(w)_B$.
 $\mathcal{N}_f^{\rightarrow}(A) \subseteq B$ if and only if $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow}(Y \setminus B) \subseteq X \setminus A$.

Let us now assume f is a bijection. This introduces two new neighbourhood schemes into play, namely $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\leftarrow}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}$. It is of the utmost importance to stress the following point, as counter-intuitive as it may seem: whereas $\mathcal{N}_f^{\rightarrow}$ is trivially deducible from $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow}$ — they both define the same graph — there is very little to no relation between $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\leftarrow}$, and we should not be looking for one. A striking example is given in section III A.

Let us now construct the quantization $Q(f)$ more formally. For $S \subseteq X \cup Y$, let $\mathcal{H}_S$ be a Hilbert space having an orthonormal basis indexed by Σ_S . We will use the usual Dirac notation, so that the elements of these bases will be denoted $|v\rangle$ for $v \in \Sigma_S$. Whenever S is the disjoint union of S_1 and S_2 , we have a natural identification $\mathcal{H}_S = \mathcal{H}_{S_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{S_2}$, where $|v\rangle$ is identified with $|v_{S_1}\rangle \otimes |v_{S_2}\rangle$. These Hilbert spaces are slightly unusual, as they are typically nonseparable, but that should not prevent us from going on. f induces by linearization a unitary morphism $Q(f) : \mathcal{H}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y$ defined by $Q(f)|v\rangle = |f(v)\rangle$. As is usual in quantum mechanics, it induces a transformation of observables, i.e., bounded operators B on $\mathcal{H}_Y$ to bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}_X$, by $\text{ad}_{Q(f)} : B \mapsto Q(f)^{-1}BQ(f)$. This is the so-called Heisenberg picture of time evolution. We could also have used the dual “Schrödinger” picture, in which the transformation acts on states rather than observables, but for the discussion of localization issues the Heisenberg picture has definite advantages. The quantum counterpart of “functions depending only on the restricted configuration w_S ” are the so-called local algebras $\mathcal{A}_S$, consisting of operators “localized in S ”. By this we mean any bounded operator on $\mathcal{H}_S$, extended in a particular way to an operator on the whole system $\mathcal{H}_X$ or $\mathcal{H}_Y$. Indeed, if S is the disjoint union of S_1 and S_2 , $\mathcal{H}_S$ is isomorphic to the Hilbert space tensor product $\mathcal{H}_{S_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{S_2}$. Hence if we split $Y = S \cup S'$ with S' the required complement, we can identify B with $B \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}_{S'}}$, acting on $\mathcal{H}_Y$. From this definition it is clear that the matrix elements of an operator $B \in \mathcal{A}_S$ satisfy

$$\langle v|B|w\rangle_Y = \langle v_S|B|w_S\rangle_S \delta_{v_{S'}, w_{S'}},$$

where δ is the Kronecker-Delta vanishing exactly when $v_{S'} \neq w_{S'}$, and the subscripts on the scalar products indicate the Hilbert space ($\mathcal{H}_Y$, resp. $\mathcal{H}_S$) in which they are taken. Technically, from the functional analytic point of view, we only use here that the tensor product of Hilbert spaces is well-defined also for non-separable spaces. Nevertheless, some readers may feel more comfortable with a “tame” situation in which we assume

- X and Y are countable, and
- for all $s \in X \cup Y$, Σ_s is finite.
- for all $x \in X$, $\mathcal{N}_f^{\rightarrow}(x)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\leftarrow}(x)$ are finite, and
- for all $y \in Y$, $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow}(y)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}(y)$ are finite.

In this case one can effectively work with the finite dimensional algebras of operators on $\mathcal{H}_S$ with finite S . The operator norm closure of this increasing net of finite dimensional algebras is then known as the quasi-local algebra $\mathcal{A}_Y^{ql}$, and is the arena in which the theory of quantum cellular automata is built in [SW04]. While the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_Y$ constructed above would be non-separable, even in the tame case, the quasi-local algebra will be separable and quite manageable. Under the hypotheses we made on the finiteness of the neighbourhood schemes, $\text{ad}_{Q(f)}$ is an isomorphism from the quasi-local algebra $\mathcal{A}_Y^{ql}$ to the quasi-local algebra $\mathcal{A}_X^{ql}$. The proof of that is essentially done in [SW04], or can be taken as consequence of the upper bound in Prop. 4.

Definition 2 The quantum dependency neighbourhood scheme of f , denoted $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^{\leftarrow}$, is defined as follows. For $y \in Y$, $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^{\leftarrow}(y)$ is the smallest subset S of X such that $\text{ad}_{Q(f)}(\mathcal{A}_y) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_S$

For $B \subseteq Y$, $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^{\leftarrow}(B)$, defined as $\bigcup_{y \in B} \mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^{\leftarrow}(y)$, is equal, as can be expected, to the smallest subset S of X such that $\text{ad}_{Q(f)}(\mathcal{A}_B) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_S$.

Proposition 2 For $A \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$ with B finite, $Q(f)(\mathcal{A}_B) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_A$ if and only if

- (1) $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow}(B) \subseteq A$;
- (2) $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}(B) \subseteq A$;
- (3) when v and w are words in Σ_X such that $v_{X \setminus A} = w_{X \setminus A}$, it is enough to know v_A and w_A to determine whether $f(v)_{Y \setminus B} = f(w)_{Y \setminus B}$.

Proof: For $v, v' \in \Sigma_X$ and $w, w' \in \Sigma_B$, let $q(v, v', w, w')$ be $\langle v | \text{ad}_{Q(f)}(|w\rangle\langle w'|) | v' \rangle$. We have

$$q(v, v', w, w') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } f(v)_B = w, f(v')_B = w' \text{ and } f(v)_{Y \setminus B} = f(v')_{Y \setminus B} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

$Q(f)(\mathcal{A}_B) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_A$ if and only if q has the following property: for every w, w' , $q(v, v', w, w')$ is equal to 0 when $v_{X \setminus A} \neq v'_{X \setminus A}$, and else depends only on v_A and v'_A .

Suppose the three points of Prop. 2 are true. Suppose $v_{X \setminus A} \neq v'_{X \setminus A}$. Since $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}(B) \subseteq A$, then $f(v)_{Y \setminus B} \neq f(v')_{Y \setminus B}$, so $q(v, v', w, w') = 0$. If we assume, on the contrary, $v_{X \setminus A} = v'_{X \setminus A}$, then it is enough to know v_A and v'_A to determine whether $f(v)_{Y \setminus B} = f(v')_{Y \setminus B}$. Moreover, as $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow}(B)$ is included in A , we can also, with the same information, know $f(v)_B$ and $f(v')_B$, which allows us to know $q(x, x', y, y')$.

For the reciprocal, let us now assume $Q(f)(\mathcal{A}_B) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_A$.

- (1) Let $v, v' \in \Sigma_X$ be words coinciding on A . According to Prop. 1, we need to prove $f(v)_B = f(v')_B$. First, $q(v, v, f(v)_B, f(v)_B) = 1$. But, by hypothesis, since $v'_A = v_A$, we get $q(v', v', f(v)_B, f(v)_B) = 1$, which means $f(v)_B = f(v')_B$.
- (2) Let $v, v' \in \Sigma_X$ be words such that $f(v)$ and $f(v')$ coincide on $Y \setminus B$. According to Prop. 1, we need to prove $v_{X \setminus A} = v'_{X \setminus A}$. That is clearly true, since $q(v, v', f(v)_B, f(v')_B) = 1$.
- (3) Let v and v' be words in Σ_X such that $v_{X \setminus A} = v'_{X \setminus A}$. Then $q(v, v', f(v)_B, f(v')_B) = 1$ if and only if $f(v)_{X \setminus B} = f(v')_{X \setminus B}$. Can this quantity be determined knowing only v_A and v'_A ? Yes: because $\mathcal{N}_f^{\rightarrow}(B) \subseteq A$, w and w' are determined by v_A and v'_A ; and for any fixed $w, w' \in \Sigma_B$, $q(v, v', w, w')$ depends only on v_A and v'_A .

□

II. THEOREMS

The quantum neighbourhood schemes, as opposed to the classical ones, are all tightly connected, as is stated by the following proposition.

Proposition 3 $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^{\rightarrow} = \mathcal{N}_{Q(f^{-1})}^{\leftarrow}$

Proof: $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^{\leftarrow}(B) \subseteq A$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{A}_A \subseteq Q(f^{-1})(\mathcal{A}_B)$. Since $\mathcal{A}_{Y \setminus B}$ commutes with $\mathcal{A}_B$, their images by $\text{ad}_{Q(f^{-1})}$ also have to commute. The quasi-local has the property that when S is the disjoint union of S_1 and S_2 , then the commutant of $\mathcal{A}_{S_1}$ in $\mathcal{A}_S$ is $\mathcal{A}_{S_2}$. In our case, we get that $Q(f^{-1})(\mathcal{A}_{Y \setminus B})$ is included in $\mathcal{A}_{X \setminus A}$, which means $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f^{-1})}^{\leftarrow}(B) \subseteq A$.

□

In order to give our first bound on the quantum neighbourhood, we need to introduce a bit of notation. If $\mathcal{N}_1 : X \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(Y)$ and $\mathcal{N}_2 : Y \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(Z)$ are two neighbourhood schemes, then $\mathcal{N}_2 \circ \mathcal{N}_1 : X \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(Z)$ is defined by $\mathcal{N}_2 \circ \mathcal{N}_1(x) = \bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{N}_1(x)} \mathcal{N}_2(y)$.

Proposition 4 $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow} \cup \mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^{\leftarrow} \subseteq \left(\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_f^{\rightarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow} \right) \cap \left(\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow} \right)$

Proof: The first inclusion follows immediately from points (1) and (2) of Prop. 1. The inclusion $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^{\leftarrow} \subseteq \left(\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_f^{\rightarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow} \right)$ is just a translation in our present formalism of lemma 4 of [SW04], and lemma 3.2 of [AN08]. The last inclusion $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^{\leftarrow} \subseteq \left(\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow} \right)$ is then obtained by applying Prop. 3. □

Theorem 1 Let n be a positive integer, $X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}$ some sets, and for $i \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket$, f_i a bijection from Σ_{X_i} to $\Sigma_{X_{i+1}}$. Then

$$\mathcal{N}_{Q(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1)}^{\leftarrow} \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^n \mathcal{N}_{f_{k-1} \circ \dots \circ f_1}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{Q(f_k)}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{k+1})}^{\rightarrow}.$$

Proof: For $k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket$, let $\mathcal{V}_k$ be $\mathcal{N}_{f_{k-1} \circ \dots \circ f_1}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{Q(f_k)}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{k+1})^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}$, and $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_1^n \mathcal{V}_k$.

- (1) Since $\mathcal{N}_{f_n}^{\leftarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{Q(f_n)}^{\leftarrow}$, then $\mathcal{N}_{f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1}^{\leftarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{f_{n-1} \circ \dots \circ f_1}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{f_n}^{\leftarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{f_{n-1} \circ \dots \circ f_1}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{Q(f_n)}^{\leftarrow} = \mathcal{V}_n \subseteq \mathcal{V}$.
- (2) Since $\mathcal{N}_{f_1}^{\rightarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{Q(f_1)}^{\rightarrow}$, then $\mathcal{N}_{(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1)^{-1}}^{\rightarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{f_1}^{\rightarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_2)^{-1}}^{\rightarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{Q(f_1)}^{\rightarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_2)^{-1}}^{\rightarrow} = \mathcal{V}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{V}$.
- (3) Let $x \in X_{n+1}$. Suppose v and w are words in Σ_{X_1} , of which we know $v_{\mathcal{V}(x)}$, $w_{\mathcal{V}(x)}$ and $v_{X_1 \setminus \mathcal{V}(x)} = w_{X_1 \setminus \mathcal{V}(x)}$. Let us prove that this information is enough to determine whether $f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1(v)_{X_{n+1} \setminus \{x\}} = f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1(w)_{X_{n+1} \setminus \{x\}}$.
 Since $\mathcal{V}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, according to Prop. 2 we know whether $f_1(v)$ and $f_1(w)$ coincide on $X_2 \setminus \mathcal{N}_{(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_2)^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}(x)$. If this fails to be true, then according to Prop. 1, we know $f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1(v)_{X_{n+1} \setminus \{x\}} \neq f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1(w)_{X_{n+1} \setminus \{x\}}$, so the question is settled. We can therefore assume it is true. Since $\mathcal{V}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, according to Prop. 1 we know the restrictions of $f_1(v)$ and $f_1(w)$ on $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f_2)}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_3)^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}(x)$. We can proceed to the next step. Indeed, we now are in the situation where we know the restrictions of $f_1(v)$ and $f_1(w)$ to $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f_2)}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_3)^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}(x)$, and we also know they coincide on its complement. On one hand, according to Prop. 2, this is enough to know whether $f_2 \circ f_1(v)$ and $f_2 \circ f_1(w)$ coincide on $X_3 \setminus \mathcal{N}_{(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_3)^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}(x)$, which we can assume to be true, for the question is settled if this is false. On the other hand, according to Prop. 1, and since $\mathcal{V}_3 \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, we can determine the restrictions of $f_2 \circ f_1(v)$ and $f_2 \circ f_1(w)$ to $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f_3)}^{\leftarrow} \circ \mathcal{N}_{(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_4)^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}(x)$. And so on: by induction, we get in the end that it can be determined whether $f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1(v)_{X_{n+1} \setminus \{x\}} = f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1(w)_{X_{n+1} \setminus \{x\}}$.

□

What comes out of this theorem is that there are essentially two ways a message can be transmitted and then carried on. The first one we will call the *nice* way: it follows the dependency graph of f , so it could also be transmitted by f itself, it is a purely classical message. The other way we will call *nasty*. It follows the reverse dependency graph of f^{-1} , and as such has no classical counterpart — at least not an obvious one. Moreover, the order in which these occur in an interrupted transmission is fixed: first nice, then nasty, and in-between, only one step needs to be fully quantum.

III. OPTIMALITY

In this section we will focus exclusively on one-dimensional reversible cellular automata. That means from now on we will have $X = \mathbb{Z}$, $f : \Sigma_X \rightarrow \Sigma_X$, and everything commutes to the shift $n \mapsto n + 1$ on $\mathbb{Z}$; so for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, Σ_n is equal to some fixed alphabet Σ , the shift on $\mathbb{Z}$ induces a shift σ on $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $f \circ \sigma = \sigma \circ f$. On top of that we assume that $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow}(0)$ is finite, and voilà! We have the usual definition of a one-dimensional reversible cellular automaton. Their quantizations are quantum reversible cellular automata (RQCA) as introduced in [SW04]. Our concern with neighbourhood schemes echoes is in this case related to the block decomposition of cellular automata, as they are studied, in the classical, in [Kar99, Kar96], or in the quantum case in [ANW07]. Indeed, decomposing a cellular automaton into local reversible blocks is a quite similar feat in the classical and quantum models, as any classical reversible block can be immediately linearized into a permutation matrix, and therefore define a quantum cellular automaton with the same block decomposition. In this respect, understanding the neighbourhood of the quantization of a classical cellular automaton gives some information on its possible block decompositions.

In many relevant cases theorem 1 gives us an optimal bound on the asymptotical rate of growth of the quantum neighbourhood, as is shown by the following corollary.

Corollary 1 *Suppose $X = Y = \mathbb{Z}$, $f : \Sigma_X \rightarrow \Sigma_Y$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

- $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow}(n) \subseteq \llbracket n - \alpha; n + \beta \rrbracket$ and
- $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\leftarrow}(n) \subseteq \llbracket n - \gamma; n + \delta \rrbracket$.

Then $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f^k)}^{\leftarrow}(0) \subseteq \llbracket -(k+1) \max(\alpha, \delta) - \min(\beta, \gamma); (k+1) \max(\beta, \gamma) + \min(\alpha, \delta) \rrbracket$.

Assuming α, β, γ and δ are all nonnegative, we get asymptotically $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{k} \mathcal{N}_{Q(f^k)}^{\leftarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow} \cup \mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow}$, a bound which clearly cannot be improved on, since we always have $\mathcal{N}_f^{\leftarrow} \cup \mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^{\rightarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^{\leftarrow}$ (cf Prop. 4).

To this point, the reader could rightfully think “well, that is certainly intriguing, but what is there to tell me that this is not some elaborate plot to make me think something nontrivial happens when quantizing these functions, whereas nothing actually happens, $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^\leftarrow$ is always equal to $\mathcal{N}_f^\leftarrow \cup \mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^\leftarrow$, and even that is just an artefact of mathematical trickery, having little to do with actual transmission of information?”. Indeed, that is certainly compatible with everything that has been said in section II, but we are going to prove that our results cannot be much improved.

We will use the following notations: for subsets A and B of $\mathbb{Z}$, $A + B$ is the Minkowski sum of A and B , i.e. $\{a + b/a \in A, b \in B\}$; $-A$ denotes $\{-a/a \in A\}$. We have the following relations: $\mathcal{N}_f^\leftarrow(n) = \{n\} + \mathcal{N}_f^\leftarrow(0)$ and $\mathcal{N}_f^\rightarrow(0) = -\mathcal{N}_f^\leftarrow(0)$.

A. Pure Nastiness

As the nice way for a RQCA to transmit information is probably unimpressive, let us start directly with a “pure” example of nasty communication.

Let $\Sigma = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^k$. For $x \in \Sigma$, x^i denotes its i -th component. We define a cellular automaton J_k on this cell structure in the following way:

$$J_k(v)_0^i = \begin{cases} v_0^i + v_1^{i+1} & \text{if } i < k \\ v_1^i & \text{if } i = k \end{cases}.$$

In other words, $J_k(v)_0 = (v_0^1 + v_1^2, v_0^2 + v_1^3, v_0^3 + v_1^4, \dots, v_0^{k-1} + v_1^k, v_1^k)$. Let us check that J_k is a reversible cellular automaton such that $\mathcal{N}_{J_k}^\leftarrow(0) = \llbracket 0; 1 \rrbracket$ and $\mathcal{N}_{J_k^{-1}}^\leftarrow(0) = \llbracket -k; -1 \rrbracket$. Let K_k be the automaton defined by the following formula: $K_k(v)_0^i = v_{-i}^k + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} v_{j-i}^j$. We are going to prove that $K_k = J_k^{-1}$.

$$\begin{aligned} K_k(J_k(v))_0^i &= J_k(v)_{-i}^k + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} J_k(v)_{j-i}^j \\ &= v_{-i+1}^1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} v_{j-i}^j + v_{j-i+1}^{j+1} \\ &= v_{-i+1}^1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} v_{j-i}^j + \sum_{j=2}^i v_{j-i}^j \\ &= v_{-i+1}^1 + v_{1-i}^1 + v_0^i \\ K_k(J_k(v))_0^i &= v_0^i \end{aligned}$$

Hence J_k is reversible and $K_k = J_k^{-1}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{N}_{J_k}^\leftarrow(0) = \llbracket 0; 1 \rrbracket$ and $\mathcal{N}_{K_k}^\leftarrow(0) = \mathcal{N}_{J_k^{-1}}^\leftarrow(0) = \llbracket -k; -1 \rrbracket$.

Let us now apply a protocol described in [AN08]. Let v be the zero word defined by $v_n^i = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in \llbracket 1; k \rrbracket$, and w defined by $w_n^i = \delta_{in}$. It is easily checked that $f(v)$ is also the zero word, whereas $f(w)_n^i = \delta_{n0}\delta_{ik}$. The point is that $f(v)$ and $f(w)$ coincide on $\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, whereas $v_k \neq w_k$. Now, imagine Alice and Bob live in X , and are actually confined respectively to k and 0 , and that the dynamics of their universe, that is X , is described by J_k . That is certainly an unusual, rather uncomfortable situation, but Alice and Bob have seen worse. Now, Alice would like to send a message to Bob; she certainly can do it, and the message would take k units of time to arrive to Bob. However, if this were a quantum world, whose dynamics were ruled by $Q(f)$, then she could send a much faster message, provided there is some prior shared entanglement. Indeed, assume the initial state is the pure $|\psi_+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|v\rangle + |w\rangle)$. Since Alice is at a place where she can distinguish v from w , she can, by applying a local phase shift, switch at will from $|\psi_+\rangle$ to $|\psi_-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|v\rangle - |w\rangle)$. One time step later, the world is in the pure state $|\phi_\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|f(v)\rangle \pm |f(w)\rangle)$. Since $f(v)$ and $f(w)$ coincide outside Bob’s place, where they are equal to zero, one can write $|\phi_\pm\rangle = |\underline{0}\rangle \otimes |\varphi_\pm\rangle$, where $\varphi_\pm$ is totally accessible to Bob, so that he can easily decide, with local operations, whether Alice sent $|\psi_+\rangle$ or $|\psi_-\rangle$. Alice was thus able to transmit one bit of information to Bob in just one time step.

Proposition 5 *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{N}_{J_k^n}^\leftarrow(0) = \llbracket 0; n \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{N}_{J_k^{-n}}^\leftarrow(0) = \llbracket -kn; -n \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{N}_{Q(J_k^n)}^\leftarrow(0) = \llbracket 0; kn \rrbracket$.*

Proof: For $n = 1$, the first two equalities have already been proven, and the third one is an immediate consequence of Prop. 4. It is not much harder to prove for $n > 1$. $\square$

Notice that the bound given in this case by theorem 1 is also optimal. This automaton thus provides us with a pure example, where the light cone of the quantized automaton is just the reunion of the classical light cone and the nasty dual one. Obviously, as k increases, the relative difference between the classical cone and the quantum one can be made arbitrarily large. It can also be easily symmetrized, by taking $\Sigma = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{2k}$, applying J_k on the first k entries, and the symmetrized of J_k on the others.

B. Toffoli Automaton

The Toffoli automaton presented in [ANW08] (definition 12) is an exemple illustrating the optimality of Prop. 4. It is defined by $\Sigma = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$ and $T(v)_0 = (v_0^1 + v_0^0 v_1^0, v_1^0)$.

Proposition 6 $\mathcal{N}_T^-(0) = \llbracket 0; 1 \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{N}_{T^{-1}}^-(0) = \llbracket -1; 0 \rrbracket$ and $\mathcal{N}_{Q(T)}^-(0) = \llbracket -1; 2 \rrbracket$.

Proof: Cf [ANW08]. □

For any cellular automaton f , if $\mathcal{N}_f^-(0) = \llbracket 0; k \rrbracket$ and $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^-(0) = \llbracket -k; 0 \rrbracket$, then it follows from Prop. 4 that $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^-(0) \subseteq \llbracket -k; 2k \rrbracket$. The Toffoli automaton can be easily “expanded” to cover this interval, just by juxtaposing k copies of it; let us call the automaton thus obtained T_k . They optimally breach the classical speed of light, under the condition that the reverse dynamics has not a greater neighbourhood than the forwards dynamics, as was the case of J_k in section III A.

This automaton has one “drawback”, though: instead of growing linearly as could be expected, the quantum halo going past the wall of light has a constant width when iterating T_k . Couldn’t that be fixed? Actually, no, according to theorem 1. Indeed, it follows immediately from it that any composition of n automata having the same neighbourhood scheme as T_k must have a quantum neighbourhood scheme included into $\llbracket -k; (n+1)k \rrbracket$, which is attained by T_k .

C. Combination

We would now like to use J_k as a sling and T_l as a projectile, in order to combine their own optimalities.

Let us define $JT_{k,l}$ on the alphabet $((\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{2l})^k$ in the following way:

$$JT_{k,l}(v)_0^i = \begin{cases} J_k(v)_0^i = v_0^i + v_1^{i+1} & \text{if } i < k \\ T_l(v)_1^i & \text{if } i = k \end{cases}.$$

This automaton has the neighbourhood scheme defined by $\mathcal{N}_{JT_{k,l}}^-(0) = \llbracket 0; l+1 \rrbracket$. Its inverse is defined by $(JT_{k,l})^{-1}(v)_0^i = T_l^{-1}(v^k)_{-i} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} v_{j-i}^j$, and we have $\mathcal{N}_{JT_{k,l}^{-1}}^-(0) = \llbracket -k-l; -1 \rrbracket$.

Its quantum neighbourhood is given by $\mathcal{N}_{Q(JT_{k,l})}^-(0) = \llbracket -l; k+2l \rrbracket$, which again attains the upper bound from Prop. 4. Let us rename our variables, and pose $x = l+1$ and $y = k+l$. We have a class of automata $f_{x,y}$ such that $\mathcal{N}_{f_{x,y}}^-(0) = \llbracket 0; x \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{N}_{f_{x,y}^{-1}}^-(0) = \llbracket -y; -1 \rrbracket$ and $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f_{x,y})}^-(0) = \llbracket -x+1; x+y-1 \rrbracket$, which is optimal. Of course, this is subject to the conditions $0 < x < y$.

Superimposing these automata

This is about as general as it gets, at least when considering neighbourhoods which are intervals — we are not going to discuss the case when the neighbourhood is disconnected, as anything and everything could then happen. Consider an arbitrary reversible cellular automaton f and suppose its neighbourhood and inverse neighbourhood are intervals. First, up to composition with a translation, it can be assumed $\mathcal{N}_f^-(0) = \llbracket 0; x \rrbracket$, with $x \geq 0$. Notice that if $x = 0$, then $\mathcal{N}_f^-(0)$ as to be also equal to $\{0\}$, which makes everything rather trivial, so we will assume $x > 0$. Let us write $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^-(0) = \llbracket y; z \rrbracket$; according to Prop. 4, is upper-bounded by $\llbracket -z - \min(x, y); x + y + \min(0, z) \rrbracket$. We have just explained how attain this bound when $y > x$ and $z = -1$. We can almost effortlessly remove some restriction on z . In order to do that, use the n -th iterate of J_k instead of J_k itself in the definition of $JT_{k,l}$. We get an automaton f such that $\mathcal{N}_f^-(0) = \llbracket 0; l+n \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^-(0) = \llbracket -kn-l; -n \rrbracket$ and $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^-(0) = \llbracket -l; kn+2l \rrbracket$, which gives, after a change of variables, $\mathcal{N}_f^-(0) = \llbracket 0; x \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{N}_{f^{-1}}^-(0) = \llbracket -y; z \rrbracket$ and $\mathcal{N}_{Q(f)}^-(0) = \llbracket -(x+z); x+y+z \rrbracket$, which is optimal, and this thus attained under the conditions $z < 0 < x < y$.

The other cases can be treated similarly, it is just a matter of combining adequately automata J and T so as to exploit the right way of communication that will attain optimality.

Conclusion

We have studied the way quantization affects the spatial dependency relations at an abstract level. We obtained formulas, both for a single step and a composition of steps, which are optimal. They point out to something unexpected, at least from the point of view of the authors, who were genuinely trying to twiddle the Toffoli automaton to make it transmit information at a higher speed: it is not possible to do this kind of things. It is as though, entering the quantum world, Alice and Bob were given a weird tool, in addition the classical communication channel: the possibility to use a “quantum joker” which explodes in a halo, and changes the classical signal into this “nasty” kind of signal.

Future works include of course a better understanding and description of this channel, which should made full use of a duality that is ever-present, if implicit, in this article: the one swapping, on one side, f and f^{-1} , and on the other side $\leftarrow$ and $\rightarrow$. It should also be possible to generalize this results by removing the conditions of countability on X and Y , maybe of finiteness of Σ_x for $x \in X \cup Y$, and certainly of finiteness of the neighbourhoods schemes.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the DFG (Forschergruppe 635) and the EU (project QICS). They would also like to warmly thank Jarkko Kari for showing them what amazing little things cellular automata are, especially how the neighbourhood and the inverse neighbourhood depend so little on each other.

-
- [AN08] Pablo Arrighi and Vincent Nesme. Quantization of cellular automata. In Bruno Durand, editor, *Proceedings of the First Symposium on Cellular Automata "Journées Automates Cellulaires" JAC 2008*, Exploratory paper track, pages 204–215, Uzès France, 04 2008. Издательство МЦНМО. ISBN 978-5-94057-377-7.
- [ANW07] Pablo Arrighi, Vincent Nesme, and Reinhard Werner. N-dimensional quantum cellular automata. 2007. [arXiv:0711.3975v1](#).
- [ANW08] Pablo Arrighi, Vincent Nesme, and Reinhard Werner. One-dimensional quantum cellular automata over finite, unbounded configurations. In *Language and Automata Theory and Applications: Second International Conference, LATA 2008, Tarragona, Spain, March 13-19, 2008. Revised Papers*, pages 64–75, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer-Verlag.
- [Kar91] Jarkko Kari. Reversibility of 2D cellular automata is undecidable. In *Cellular Automata: Theory and Experiment*, volume 45, pages 379–385. MIT Press, 1991.
- [Kar96] Jarkko Kari. Representation of reversible cellular automata with block permutations. *Mathematical Systems Theory*, 29(1):47–61, 1996.
- [Kar99] Jarkko Kari. On the circuit depth of structurally reversible cellular automata. *Fundam. Inf.*, 38(1-2):93–107, 1999.
- [SW04] Benjamin Schumacher and Reinhard F. Werner. Reversible quantum cellular automata. 05 2004. [arXiv:quant-ph/0405174](#).